

extra manpower and resources. These increases were achieved by working existing crews harder. In some cases, crews were working continuous 72-hour shifts. The Pacific area alone increased its temporary duty travel by 70 percent just to maintain the pace of routine operations.

So what we are saying is that we are asking the Coast Guard to do more. We began to give them significant resources last year. They are doing more. They are having successes. But unless we continue to support the Coast Guard, unless we continue to give them the resources they need, they will not be able to do the job we are asking them to do. It is as simple as that.

In placing these additional demands upon our service members, we have to worry about safety. I understand lost workdays and shore injuries are up 29 percent and aircraft ground mishaps are up almost 50 percent from previous years. This is something we need to be concerned about. We are talking about human lives. Further, downtime of air and marine craft is on the rise.

The demands on the Coast Guard are simply not decreasing; they are increasing. They have to have our support. This is why I will continue to call for the strongest investment possible for our Coast Guard. I applaud my colleagues who worked with me, including the Senator from Georgia, Mr. COVERDELL, and the Senator from Florida, Mr. GRAHAM, who stepped up to the challenge to gain additional investments last year. They and others in the House and the Senate and our Appropriations Committee particularly in the Senate deserve a great deal of the credit for the recent successes we are seeing in drug interdiction. These successes simply would not have happened but for what Congress did last year.

However, this is not a one-shot deal. This is not something we can do in 1 year and think it is done. We have to continue year after year. The additional 1999 funding is simply not the sole cure. It is just the downpayment.

We must have a sustained, multiyear effort if we expect our Coast Guard to be able to meet daily challenges and if we expect them to provide the critical services the American people expect and demand. Unless we continue with the investments we began last year, we will be sending a signal to the drug lords that this is just a temporary, maybe even a headline-grabbing effort, a politically expedient exercise. In fact, the writing is on the wall. If we fail to maintain and build on our support for the Coast Guard, these drug dealers will not believe we are serious and the Coast Guard will not be able to continue the current level of counterdrug operations in the future.

The bottom line is we need to continue more resources. I applaud the efforts of my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee. I know they tried

to allocate a more sizable portion of the budget. They were faced with daunting challenges. As a Congress and as a people we must do more. We have to. As further opportunities in this Congress present themselves, we must take those opportunities and try to provide additional funds. As I said, adequate funding for the Coast Guard should be a top national priority. So much hinges on it.

I urge my colleagues to join me in sending a message to all of the hard-working men and women of the U.S. Coast Guard that we do not take them for granted. We will continue to make sure they have the tools necessary to accomplish the many demanding missions we ask of them on behalf of our country.

AMAZING GRACE

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I am troubled today. I am troubled because I find myself standing on the Senate floor once again raising an issue that cuts to the very core of human cruelty and moral disregard. I have stood here before, many of my colleagues have stood here before, repeatedly speaking about my strong belief that the partial-birth abortion procedure is wrong. Not only is it wrong, it is evil. The procedure is a reprehensible act of human violence, violence against a human being.

I recently stood here not too many weeks ago and told Members of the Senate about a helpless baby named "Hope." On April 6, 1999, Baby Hope's mother entered a Dayton, OH, abortion clinic with the intention of having her pregnancy terminated through a partial-birth abortion. However, the abortion did not succeed.

Here is what happened: Dr. Haskell, who we have heard so much about on the Senate floor, the infamous Dayton abortionist, started the procedure as usual by inserting instruments known as laminaria into the woman and by applying seaweed. This process is supposed to slowly dilate the cervix so the child eventually can be removed and killed. That is the procedure. That is what they do.

After this initial step, in this particular instance, Dr. Haskell sent the woman home because it usually takes 2 or 3 days before the baby can be removed from the womb and the abortion completed. Expecting to return in 2 or 3 days, this woman followed the doctor's orders and went home to Cincinnati.

Soon after she left the abortion clinic, her cervix started dilating too quickly, causing her to go into labor. Shortly after midnight, on the first day of the procedure, she entered the hospital and gave birth to a very much alive but very tiny baby. The neonatologist determined that Baby Hope's lungs were too underdeveloped

to sustain life without the help of a respirator. Baby Hope, however, was not placed on a respirator. Instead, the poor, defenseless creature was left to die only a little more than 3 hours after birth.

I am back on the floor again today because we now, tragically, have another example of a partial-birth abortion in Ohio that did not go according to the abortionist's plan, this one occurring on August 19, a couple of weeks ago.

The Dayton Daily News reported this incident. The procedure was again at the hands of Dr. Haskell. Here, too, he started the barbaric procedure by dilating the mother's cervix. Similarly, this woman went into labor only 1 hour later, was admitted to Good Samaritan Hospital, and gave birth to a baby girl a short time later. This time, however, a miracle occurred. This little baby lived.

A medical technician appropriately named this precious little "Baby Grace." After her birth, she was transferred to a neonatal intensive care unit at Children's Hospital in Dayton. The Montgomery County Children's Services Board has temporary, interim custody of little Baby Grace. She likely will face months of hospitalization and possible lifelong complications, we don't know, all resulting from being premature and the induced abortion.

I am appalled and sickened by the fact that both of these partial-birth abortions occurred anywhere. I am particularly offended by the fact they occurred in my home State of Ohio. But wherever they occur, it is a human tragedy.

I have said this before and I will say it again; the partial-birth abortion should be outlawed. Partial-birth abortion should be outlawed in our civilized society.

When we hear about the brutal death of Baby Hope and we think about the miracle of Baby Grace, we have to stop and ask, to what depths have we sunk in this country? Partial-birth abortion is a very clear matter of right and wrong, good versus evil. It is my wish there will come a day, I hope and pray, when I no longer have to come to this Senate floor and talk about partial-birth abortions. Until that day arrives, the day when the procedure has been outlawed in our country, I must continue to plead for the protection of unborn fetuses threatened by partial-birth abortions.

In the name of Baby Hope, let's stop the killing. In the name of Baby Grace, let's protect the living.

I yield the floor.

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, first, I compliment my friend and colleague from Ohio for the statement he made. Frankly, the announcement he made

that this tragedy called partial-birth abortion is happening today and it is happening very frequently—I appreciate him calling attention to it. I hope our colleagues listened and I hope our colleagues this year will pass a ban on that very gruesome procedure which is the murder of a child as it is being born.

I thank my friend and colleague. I hope and expect Congress will pass it this year. Maybe with the votes necessary to overturn the President's veto.

I thank him for his statement.

CORRECTING THE RECORD ON THE REPUBLICAN EDUCATION BUDGET

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I would like to correct the record, because I know I heard a number of my colleagues say the Republican budget is slashing education, it's at the lowest end, it's the last appropriation bill we are taking up. Let me correct the record. Let me give you some facts.

One, the budget the Republicans passed earlier this year had an increase for education, not a decrease. The Appropriations Committee has yet to mark up the Labor-HHS bill. They are going to mark it up next week. I understand from Senator SPECTER and others they plan on appropriating \$90 billion. The amount of money we have in the current fiscal year is \$83.8 billion. So that is an increase of about \$6.2 billion for FY2000. That is an increase of about 9 percent. That is well over inflation. I think it is too much. I think we should be freezing spending. We should not be increasing spending. But I just want to correct the record. It bothers me to think some people are trying to manipulate the facts, to build up their case.

The Democrats are well aware that the Appropriations Committee is going to be marking up a bill that is going to have at least as much money this year as we spent last year in education. I hope we change the priorities. I hope we follow the guidance of my colleague from Washington, the Presiding Officer, and give the States some flexibility. I haven't heard anybody say "Let's cut the total amount of funds going to education," but I have heard, "Let's give the States, Governors and school boards more flexibility so they can do what they need to do in improving quality education. Let's hold them accountable to improve the quality of education. Let's not just come up with more Federal programs."

I heard both of my colleagues say, "Boy, we need more Federal teachers or more school buildings." Is that really the business of the Federal Government? Are we supposed to make that decision that this school district or this school needs more teachers, or this school should be repaired, or this school should be replaced? Is that a Federal decision? I don't think so. It

just so happens that within the last hour I met with the Governor of Oklahoma, the Governor of Nevada and the Governor of Utah. They say they have already reduced class size and some of them have already made significant investments in schools. But, they need more help. They want flexibility. They want to be able to use the money for individual students with disabilities. We should give them that flexibility. But our colleagues seem to think, "Oh, no, we have to have 100,000 Federal teachers. The Governor of Nevada said that in the city of Las Vegas alone they hire 18,000 new teachers every year. Why in the world should we be dictating? In last year's budget agreement we needed 30,000 teachers. Now we need to go to 100,000 teachers? Is that the Federal governments responsibility? I don't think so.

I don't think the Federal Government should be dictating that this State or this school district needs to hire more teachers or build more buildings or put in more computers. Let's give them the money we spend—and altogether the Federal Government spends over \$100 billion on education—let's give the States the flexibility to spend that money in ways that will really improve the quality of education. Maybe that will go to increasing the number of teachers or to buildings and construction. Maybe it will be in computers and in training. Maybe it will be in retention or it will be in bonuses for the best teachers. Why should we be making that decision? We don't know those schools. We don't know those districts. We don't know those superintendents. We are not serving on those PTAs. This really should not be a Federal responsibility. Let's give that responsibility to the local school boards and to the States and not have more dictates and more Federal programs.

There are already over 760 Federal education programs to date. Our colleagues on the Democrat side would like to add even more programs, as if that is going to improve the quality of education. I don't think so.

Just a couple more facts: Labor-HHS funding, which is the appropriations bill we are talking about, has been rising and growing dramatically. Yet I hear, "Oh, they are slashing this bill by 17 percent." Wait a minute, let's get the bill on the floor before we start saying we are slashing the bill. What we passed and appropriated and spent in 1997 was \$71 billion. In 1996, it was \$64.4 billion. It went to \$71 billion in 1997, that's over a 10 percent increase. From 1997 to 1998 it went from \$71 billion to \$80.7 billion, again well over a 10 percent increase. Last year it went from \$80.7 to \$83.9 billion, plus there were some advanced appropriations of about \$6 billion.

So, again there was a big increase from last year and we are talking

about increasing it even further for next year, for the year 2000. So this rhetoric by the Democrats that is designed to scare people and to get people activated on the education bill, is not substantiated by the facts.

I want to address a couple of other things we can do for education and for the American taxpayer. But the President has to help us do it by signing the tax bill that is now before him. We have \$11 billion of tax relief targeted towards education in the tax bill. If the President wants to improve education he can sign the tax bill and I hope he will. We allow for student loans, greater deductions and we provide extended assistance for education. Right now, people can save \$500 on educational savings accounts. We increase that to \$2,000.

It is vitally important that the President sign the tax bill. In addition, we have a lot of relief for taxpayers in the bill. I will just mention a couple of them.

I have heard a lot of people, Democrats and Republicans, say the marriage penalty is unfair. It's unfair for the present day Tax Code to penalize a couple because they happen to be married. In other words, when they get married their combined tax load should not be greater than when they were single and paying separately. And it is. The marriage penalty averages out about \$1,400. For the privilege of being married you have to pay an extra \$1,400. A lot of us think that is grossly unfair. We want to change it.

The President can change it. We, in Congress, have changed it. We sent the bill to the President's desk. If he signs it we will be eliminating the marriage penalty, for all practical purposes, for almost all married couples.

We also want to give relief to individuals who, in many cases, are at the lowest end of the economic ladder in the tax bill. I have heard some people say, "Oh, that tax cut package, that's a tax cut for the wealthiest people." That's hogwash. We cut taxes for taxpayers, people who are in the lowest end of the income-tax schedule. They get a 7 percent reduction because we reduced the rate from 15 percent to 14 percent. It doesn't sound like much, but that is a 7 percent reduction for somebody on the lowest end of the economic ladder. That is a significant tax reduction.

Wait a minute, what are you doing for the wealthier people? We are reducing the rate from 39.6 to 38.6, and we do not do that until the outyears. That doesn't happen until several years later. That would amount to a little less than 3 percent. So we give a much greater percentage reduction in tax cuts to the people on the lower end of the scale. We actually make the tax schedule a little more progressive.

We provide a tax cut for taxpayers, and honestly it is not very much of